

**Summary Report
NELAC Breakout Sessions
Overland Park, Kansas
August 14, 2006**

Provided by:

**National Forensic Science Technology Center (NFSTC)
August 28, 2006**

Introduction

Facilitated discussions to obtain comments and feedback on the Self-Sufficiency Task Group (SSTG) and Partnership Planning Team (PPT) reports were held in three breakout sessions on Monday, August 14, from 1:30 pm to 5 pm. Facilitators, scribes and note takers were assigned to each session:

Session	Facilitators	Scribe	Note taker
1	Silky Labie Steve Arms	Pat Hurr	Susan Johns
2	Judy Duncan Ann Marie Allen	David Speis	David Epstein
3	Richard Sheibley Alfredo Sotomayor	Karen Varnado	Carol Batterton

To ensure consistency between break out sessions, a brief meeting was with the facilitators to review the outline for the break out session discussions. The outline for the breakout sessions is found in Appendix 1:

In addition to the NELAC break out sessions held on Monday, INELA solicited comments on the SSTG and PPT reports from 8 am – 10 am on Wednesday, August 16, 2006. This comment session was facilitated by David Speis and modeled after the NELAC break out sessions.

A summary section has been included in this report by the contractor to assist the Partnership Planning Team in identifying the major topics/issues brought forward during the break out sessions.

The actual comments and suggestions (as recorded by the break out session note takers and scribes) are included in the comment section of the report. These comments have been grouped together under topical headings selected by the contractor.

Summary of Issues

Organization

Suggestions to modify the proposed structure of the programs:

There were several suggestions to modify the program structure.

- Outreach was seen as a member service.
- There was a suggestion that advocacy be a board function.
- It was suggested that the technical assistance program be split into outreach and training.
- The annual meeting was seen as an administrative function.
- Setting ranges and limits for PT providers were seen as functions of the database (under administration).

Suggestions for the Laboratory Accreditation Program:

There were many suggestions for the laboratory accreditation program (as defined in the PPT report). These included the following:

- Improve the program/standard
- Address dispute resolution
- Remove barriers to acceptance
- Recognize non-state and private sector accrediting bodies
- Use ISO 17011 as framework for AA recognition
- Address mutual recognition for laboratory accreditations and accrediting authorities
- Address consistency
- Stability is needed in the laboratory accreditation program
- Develop programs to meet a wider customer base (e.g., for non-water)

Standards Development

There were several suggestions to modify the standards development process. The major issue, however, was how the standards development and adoption functions were to be handled. There was no consensus on this issue.

Technical Assistance

There were suggestions about the technical assistance program, to include:

- Expand outreach functions
- Standardize and expand training

Advocacy

There were suggestions about the advocacy program to include:

- Partner with other organizations representing laboratories (e.g., small laboratories)
- Reach out to EPA offices
- Use advocacy to assist states during transition

Participation

There were a number of suggestions about participation in the programs. These included:

- Get EPA involved
- Get more states involved
- There were many comments about having a broad, balanced participation but there were also concerns about state acceptance of such a model.
- There were suggestions that certain groups might participate in an advisory status versus participating as voting members
- Define limits for government participation in a not-for-profit
- Tap into unused resources

Governance

Suggestions on the corporate structure/ Board of Directors

There were many comments suggesting that the interest groups and their representation on the board needed to be reviewed. Along with this were suggestions on how the proposed board structure could be modified to give these interest groups positions on the board.

Membership

There were suggestions about:

- Expanding outreach efforts to NELAC members.
- There was a suggestion to look at a two tiered membership (delegates, representatives) for the initial members.
- There was a suggestion to consider only organizations (rather than individuals) as members.

Personnel

There were suggestions on:

- The use of staff versus volunteers.
- The authority of the board (versus) the AAs was also an issue.
- Duties such as fiscal and maintaining the web site were identified.
- There were also comments about the executive director, program directors and the organizational structure.

Continuation of Essential Functions

The Transition Plan

The issues identified during the discussion include:

- Review plan for interim governance
- Address AA concerns about the continuation of the NELAP program
- Define how things will work without the director.
- Provide legislative outreach to assist states to change laws
- Get legal advice
- Amend rules and bylaws
- Access historical records
- Address fiscal issues

Name

There were major concerns expressed about the impact of a name change. The issues to be addressed include:

- Use a transition period for name change
- An explanation is needed for the name change
- The results of the advisory ballots are provided.

Communication Plan

There were a number of suggestions for communicating updates during the transition period. The consensus was clear that an aggressive campaign to inform the membership needs to continue.

Comments from Participants

The comments received during the break out sessions have been italicized to distinguish them from the topical headings added by the contractor. In some cases, a comment was included under multiple topical headings.

Organization

The organization chart was to be used to help guide the discussion. The discussion was to focus on the key program, the duties to be performed in each key program and who should participate in each key program

Suggestions to modify the proposed structure of the programs:

- *Move outreach to member services – it is more of a promotional thing*
- *Delete Advocacy as a program – make it a function of the Board / Umbrella (to increase efficiency).*
- *Setting ranges and limits for PT providers should be moved to administration (database)*
- *Move inspector and evaluator training from technical assistance to the lab accreditation program.*
- *Split technical assistance into two programs: outreach and training*
- *Move the annual meeting to the administrative section.*

Suggestions for the Laboratory Accreditation Program:

- Improve the program/standard
 - *Include project level planning, to include chemists in the project planning along with data users. NELAC standards could be expanded to include a requirement for project planning.*
 - *Remove barriers to acceptance by other groups such as those who wish to use performance approaches.*
 - *Need more focus and detail on services and goods to be sold (product development).*
 - *No sector breakout for laboratory accreditation – no function for field activities*
 - *Field Activities: Tech Assistance/Advocacy: No mention of FMO in these areas. Needs to be addressed. They will not get involved if not included.*
 - *PT providers - how will ranges and limits be set?*
 - *Under contract lab program – talked about labs – what do I get for that – there is a presumption that the data has to be good because it is certified – or I got bad data, but the lab is certified – need to do caveat emptor – 2 way street – can have good/bad data under any circumstance – says you are capable for generating good data*
 - *NELAC went off track – political issues – went to the lowest common denominator – NELAC certified did not really get you anything – better long term strategy to go for a higher standard*

- *Raise standards of assessors and the on site program*
- *Lab that makes the on-site audit should mean something*
- *Implementation of Standards need to be better quality – consistent high level implementation*
- *Standards need improvements – cannot revoke labs where should but the standard does not allow for it.*
- *The goal is a national program to this level – hurt for the process is the 2 tier system in most of the states*
- *Conflict of interest could be avoided thru careful selection of assessors– use someone outside the state – could use trained assessors from another states – witness conduct of assessments – when assessment team proposed – ask the conflict of interest questions*
- *Everything is based on water chemistry – you are trying to shove non-chemistry into the chemistry model – work on those areas*
- *Need to build standards for data review and quality to see if the systems are actually working*
- *Wants quality systems approach but also data review*
- *Accommodate performance approach into field of accreditation*
- *Address dispute resolution*
 - *Dispute resolution – at more than the AA level – also between AA and Labs*
 - *Process for dispute resolution – under administration or under lab accreditation?*
- *Remove barriers to acceptance*
 - *Remove barriers to acceptance by other groups such as those who wish to use performance approaches.*
 - *tug of war between private and states – large labs and small labs – could we have a grading system A to D – small labs could maybe get competency rather than fully range*
- *Recognize non-state and private sector accrediting bodies*
 - *Other organizations (DOD, DOE, A2LA) performing accreditations should be involved and acceptable*
 - *A2LA – like to see private sector accrediting bodies be considered*
- *Use ISO 17011 as framework for AA recognition*
 - *ISO 17011 – be provided as framework for AA accreditation*
 - *Have we considered becoming an ISO organization – affiliation with ISO*
 - *We are moving closer to ISO without the benefits – we want an international standard*

- Address mutual recognition for laboratory accreditations and accrediting authorities
 - *Reciprocity is not there right now. A merged organization will provide this.*
 - *Is the organization itself going to recognize the AAs? Someone has to recognize and then the other AAs have to say they recognize that recognition.*
 -
- Address consistency
 - *Standards development – need to have a high level review process to assure internal consistency & coordination*
 - *Is the review board going to hold the AAs to the core values?*
 - *That will start with consistency with on-site evaluations of the states*
 - *Implementation of Standards need to be better quality – consistent high level implementation*
 - *Standards need to be coordinated*
- Stability is needed in the laboratory accreditation program
 - *Is this really what it is going to be – how do I know that by the time I get everything done, this will be where it is at – is it going to be stable. Stability is issue*
 - *Frustration among AAs – how do we part of a moving target – AAs been doing this for about 5 years – had to allow them some times to get up to speed – did not have a stable standard for a while – having 2 organizations come back together in a quick efficient manner – will give credibility*
 - *People are just getting used to the standards – process finally getting stability and familiarity – just starting to work now.*
- Develop programs to meet a wider customer base (e.g., for non-water)
 - *Very important to reach out to EPA offices – little buy in from other programs – office of water – good but work with other programs as well*
 - *tug of war between private and states – large labs and small labs – could we have a grading system A to D – small labs could maybe get competency rather than fully range*
 - *Everything is based on water chemistry – you are trying to shove non-chemistry into the chemistry model – work on those areas*

Standards Development

- Review the standards development process
 - *Use the INELA model*
 - *Standards development - need to have a high level review process to assure internal consistency & coordination*
 - *ASTM is a better model – serious due process problems with INELA – how they deal with negative problems – other things – committee structure works*
 - *Broader scope of standards development than NELAC's scope*
- Standards development versus standards adoption
 - *Is the adoption function required if there is a true consensus within the SDO group?*
 - *The adoption process should be within the SDO, and the adoption box should be replaced with consistency of application.*

Technical Assistance

- Expand outreach functions
 - *Include mentoring and outreach to data users.*
 - *Will this include assistance in standard interpretation?*
 - *Will this include assistance to laboratories?*
 - *Field Activities: Tech Assistance/Advocacy: No mention of FMO in these areas. Needs to be addressed. They will not get involved if not included.*
 - *Legislative outreach seems to be missing – might have to change state law*
 - *Education of data users is needed – certification is not the be all and end all*
- Standardize and expand training
 - *Approval process for training of third party assessors*
 - *Curriculum approval, endorsement of training program*
 - *Inspector or evaluator training - that is included under technical assistance – have that included the lab accreditation program – people implementing should have a hand in training the evaluators – will there be training for air inspectors, waste water training?*
 - *A2LA – international model – audited by peer evaluation teams – by international accrediting authorities – use 17011 – you need training for the peer evaluations so you are using well trained personnel*

Advocacy

- Partner with other organizations representing laboratories (e.g., small laboratories)
 - *Partnership with other organization with the other labs. E.g. AMWA – does not support NELAP – need the partnership. – go under advocacy*
 - *Add partnerships with other group – like those with small labs*
- Reach out to EPA offices
 - *Very important to reach out to EPA offices – little buy in from other programs – office of water – good but work with other programs as well*
 - *What we are trying to do is determine quality without data quality objectives – if you are trying to sell idea – promote data quality objectives to be adopted by EPA*
- Use advocacy to assist states during transition
 - *Use the advocacy function to get the states to understand that this is based on the NTTAA and consensus standards rather than governmentally developed standards.*
 - *Advocacy: What about Public Relations? Previously came up against a wall with a lot of states. What kinds of efforts will be put towards PR? Are there funds available for this?*
 - *Also outreach to conversion – because NELAP ceases and director ceases – might not have a program any more need legislation to speak to what to do when NELAP goes away*
 - *Problem with NELAP labs – if NELAP dissolved – investment needs to be considered – changing standards, letterhead – NELAP is recognized now – what happens when this goes away – transition plan for labs and data uses – things the same but name has changed – advocacy program to get the word out*

Participation

- Get EPA involved
 - *State lab directors are concerned about statutory issues and if their states will allow membership in an NGO. The perception is that the states signed up because it was an EPA initiative and buy-in may fade without the EPA.*
 - *Key component – how can EPA participate?*
 - *CFR 142.10 – EPA is mandated to create a national program – until EPA creates a national program*
 - *Very important to reach out to EPA offices – little buy in from other programs – office of water – good but work with other programs as well*
 - *Reach out to program offices*

- Get more states involved
 - *You are getting comments from the choir – you have other states – what are you going to do to solicit their ideas and get involved*
 - *How are you going to get states to come in?*
 - *How do we get more states to participate? We started with 48 states – many of them gone*
 - *Don't do it like you did before – at some point you stop listening to the other states – at some point AZ started to vote no – voted no because he wanted people to ask why – pay attention to them – states are on board – made it happen for them – the rest all left*
 - *Want an open a process where implementing the standards – states want to be included and listened to*
 - *What about the states that don't come anymore*

- Broad, balanced participation versus state acceptance
 - *How can all parties be involved in all aspects of the laboratory accreditation program, such as the regulated community being involved in the process or AA recognition?*
 - *States might not be willing to accept the standards written by such a broad group.*
 - *Should the definition of AAs be expanded to include private and other governmental organizations?*
 - *An inclusive organization (as listed in the core values) cannot limit participation in certain areas.*
 - *Database is administrative – but it is a technical too – is there a way for others to participate?*
 - *Is implementation and decision making limited to government*
 - *Value of org up to not – work together as peers – that would be a peer review – all important stakeholders – states and feds – not private labs*
 - *When you say only government orgs in implementation etc is government only – I think private sector can bring something to the table even if they cannot vote – advantage to have people who are stakeholders but not regulators on the AA committee just for balance*
 - *Agree that there should be an advisory group to AAs – decision making limited to government – think carefully about that – balanced board making decisions that AAs have to follow – only AA authority is what is given to them by the state – that restricted to accreditation decisions. The only authority is the authority to accredit labs – that is only authority the states have – all other authority is from the board.*
 - *Want an open a process where implementing the standards – states want to be included and listened to*
 - *why is there any box up there except the implementation of standards that is not open – open participation in all the boxes*
 - *Peer review is fine but why can't we all participate?*
 - *Government should be part of this and other federal agencies*

- *Recognition of AAs may need to split up – homeland security might come in and accredit – there may be different levels – if we decided to go with open participation – there may be times when that might not be possible*
- *See a conflict of interest with private sector evaluating the evaluators*
- *Has to take the pieces and make them open – need an open PT board.*
- *An inclusive organization (as listed in the core values) cannot limit participation in certain areas*
- *What authority would the umbrella group have over the states?*
- *Involve other accrediting stakeholders*
- *Involve third parties in laboratory accreditation*
- *Adoption only works if the adoption is on the government side*
- *Standard could get voted in that the AAs could not implement*
- *AAs want regulatory control*
- *Lab accreditation box must be completely open to all members*
- *Small labs are not represented in adoption box*
- **Advisory status versus voting participation**
 - *Agree that there should be an advisory group to AAs – decision making limited to government –*
 - *When you say only government orgs in implementation etc is government only – I think private sector can bring something to the table even if they cannot vote – advantage to have people who are stakeholders but not regulators on the AA committee just for balance*
 - *Acceptable if advisory*
 - *Veto power to the AAs implementing the program*
 - *I will be comfortable paying fees and participating but not having a vote*
- **Define limits for government participation in a not-for-profit**
 - *State lab directors are concerned about statutory issues and if their states will allow membership in an NGO. The perception is that the states signed up because it was an EPA initiative and buy-in may fade without the EPA.*
 - *Are governments allowed to integrally run non-profits?*
- **Tap into unused resources**
 - *PPT is too small a committee – don't be afraid to ask the private sector for help – with mailings, etc*

Governance

- Corporate structure/ Board of Directors
 - Define interest groups and their representation on the board
 - *Should the definition of AAs be expanded to include private and other governmental organizations?*
 - *Need a PT person as an “other”*
 - *Need more representation for labs in the board makeup – balance is not evident*
 - *No need for ex-officio – either they should be on the board or not*
 - *Maybe more than 12 members, with some substructure of committees in the bylaws. (See special committee report).*
 - *Need better definition of the 4 categories of board makeup.*
 - *Consider adding House of Delegates and House of Representatives in the initial membership of the new organization. Maybe go back to the meeting where the 2003 Standard was adopted to pick up more initial members (2001?).*
 - *New BOD: Need to set a maximum number of members for each section.*
 - *Saw proposal for the board – need a balanced consensus group – define the interest groups – having defined them and make sure they are balanced*
 - *Need a PT person as an “other”*
 - *Need more representation for labs in the board makeup – balance is not evident*
 - *No need for ex-officio – either they should be on the board or not*
 - *Need better definition of the 4 categories of board makeup.*
 - *How are you defining AAs? AA may not fit so well in the organization – certifying authority – someone who is recognized into this organization – does not have to be the same as right now – use the ISO accrediting bodies – then define if NELAP AA or non NELAP AA*
 - *We have to define interest groups first – then do the process*
 - ◆ *INELA groups might need to be expanded*
 - ◆ *Data users*
 - ◆ *Territories and tribes*
 - ◆ *It is possible to exclude state or government – may want to specify so you don’t exclude*
 - ◆ *May want to have federal AA, state AA, 2nd party, etc*
 - ◆ *Federal lab, private lab – etc – meet requirements for different experience*
 - ◆ *Can the definition of a governmental organization be expanded beyond the conventional definition (county, municipal, tribes, etc.)?*
 - *Want the board to be inclusive of as many stakeholders*
 - *Labs should be more clearly defined*
 - *Establish what an AA body is – allow participation*

- Board structure
 - *Consider rotating / changing composition of the boards and committees that will be acting in the interim.*
 - *Do you have committees for the programs? The programs don't fit the committees*
 - *Maybe more than 12 members, with some substructure of committees in the bylaws. (See special committee report).*
 - *Have liaison members – ex-officio members*
 - *On very first board – no more than the first board come from the current INELA and NELAC boards*
 - *Term limits? Should consider cross participation in committees – limit membership in committees – limit a person to one committee*
 - *Liaisons with EPA program offices would be good.*
- Membership
 - *Membership outreach*
 - *Consider adding a house of delegates and a house of representatives in the initial membership of the new organization. Maybe go back to the meeting where the 2003 Standard was adopted to pick up more initial members (2001?).*
 - *Include all attendees of all meetings*
 - *Invite previous attendees*
 - *Organizational membership – why? Money*
 - *Data users, etc*
 - *Pay for states to send a representative*
 - *Put into state funds (EPA) to support meetings*
 - *Entities require certification*
 - *Include decision makers*
 - *Consider no individual members – only corporations*
- Personnel
 - *Staff versus volunteers*
 - *Critical functions that occur frequently should be carried out by staff members – identify roles of proper direction. Website and database development and maintenance are critical.*
 - *Some program work waxes and wanes*
 - *Standards development – probably needs a staff member to coordinate that effort and committees (could be ½ time)*
 - *Support staff to make the posting happen*
 - *Could assessors be voluntary or part time?*

- Authority – AA versus Board
 - What is board authority over AAs?
 - Who controls the program
 - Where do the AAs fit in?
 - What is the relationship of the recognition program to the board
 - Are AAs self governing for assessments?
- Duties
 - *Immediate need for financial & budgeting duties*
 - *Website and database development and maintenance are critical.*
- Executive director
 - *From SSTG report – job description based on current NELAP/NELAC director. Was the intent to draft something that was currently being done or what she thought should be done?*
- Program directors
 - *It would be nice to have a director to coordinate the committees so they know what is going on – will help with coordination and consistency particularly with standards development*
 - *Accreditation should be full time*
 - *Need someone who could devote half time or full time to the effort (accreditation)*
 - *Standards development – probably needs a staff member to coordinate that effort and committees (could be ½ time)*
 - *Identify roles*
- Organizational structure
 - *Consider having program directors report to the executive director*
 - *Executive director put in between the umbrella organization and programs*

Continuation of essential functions

- Transition plan
 - Review plan for interim governance
 - *Consider rotating / changing composition of the boards and committees that will be acting in the interim.*
 - Address AA concerns about the continuation of the NELAP program
 - *What will AAs put on certificates in the interim? When would a new name be applied?*
 - *The timeline is very compressed.*
 - *Credible recognition of AAs – EPA thru regions is recognizing the authority for a level field*
 - *Is the organization itself going to recognize the AAs? Someone has to recognize and then the other AAs have to say they recognize that recognition.*

- *Also outreach to conversion – because NELAP ceases and director ceases – might not have a program any more need legislation to speak to what to do when NELAP goes away*
- *Problem with NELAP labs – if NELAP dissolved – investment needs to be considered – changing standards, letterhead – NELAP is recognized now – what happens when this goes away – transition plan for labs and data uses – things the same but name has changed – advocacy program to get the word out*
- *Will a merged organization still be recognized as an ANSI?*
- *What will AAs put on certificates in the interim? When would a new name be applied?*
- *Are current NELAP AAs going to be grandfathered into the organization*
- *What happens to labs currently accredited by NELAP in January*
- *Are states going to offer NELAP accreditation in January? What will we do about new accreditations*
- *Is the recognition of new (or continuance of continuance) AAs implicit in the plan?*
- *What role will the new organization have in the next round of accreditations?*
- *Are there copyright issues with use of logos, etc*
- *Concern renewing NELAP accreditation in a couple of months – if NELAP goes away – what is the new program – have to thought about if the program going to be similar*
- *Non-NELAC state – need in rules and statute re the program – if no direct, is the program still valid – could be losing labs when Lara leaves*
- *Define how things will work without the director.*
- *In past – regions did on site of AAs and made recommendations to director*
- *What role will this new org, new board, transition board role, etc – have in the next round of AA evaluations starting in 2007? Since the current certificates have been extended 1 year – next round of evaluations will start in October 2007 – who will make up teams, chose teams, issue reports to?*
- *Non-NELAC state – need in rules and statute re the program – if no direct, is the program still valid – could be losing labs when Lara leaves*
- *The constitution allows us to have a director who is not an EPA – state or other federal individual – the issue is appointing a director when we need one –*
- *Rules talk about EPA administering the program*
- *Board come up with something in writing – to help NELAP and non NELAP states – also EPA – to say this is what the transition plan is – and there is something coming down the pike*
- *Provide legislative outreach to assist states to change laws*
- *Legislative outreach seems to be missing – might have to change state law*
- *Get legal advice*
- *Needs a legislative section – high profile – attorney needed*

- *When do we start talking about lawyers?*
- *There is insurance available also for law suits*
- *Are there copyright issues with use of logos, etc*
- *You are getting close to retaining counsel to handle these issues*

- *Amend rules and bylaws*
- *The constitution allows us to have a director who is not an EPA – state or other federal individual – the issue is appointing a director when we need one*
–
- *Rules talk about EPA administering the program*
- *Board come up with something in writing – to help NELAP and non NELAP states – also EPA – to say this is what the transition plan is – and there is something coming down the pike*

- *Access historical records*
- *Get access to NELAP/NELAC records*

- *Address fiscal issues*
- *INELA documents will be ISO documents, licensed, cannot be free as originally planned. Funding source but not large.*
 - *Immediate need for financial & budgeting duties*
 - *Selling the Standard is part of the process.*
 - *Funding sources for INELA/NELAC organization a large question/issue?*
 - *Advocacy: What about Public Relations? Previously came up against a wall with a lot of states. What kinds of efforts will be put towards PR? Are there funds available for this?*
 - *Where will the money come from – was it coming from cooperative agreement?*

- *Name*
 - *Use a transition period for name change*
 - *Use a transition period to handle the cost of a name change*
 - *What will AAs put on certificates in the interim? When would a new name be applied?*
 - *When will the new name become effective*
 - *There are lab costs with a name change – reports, education, clients, training*
 - *States will have to change regulations, change certification*

- An explanation is needed for the name change
 - *Why do we have to do this – commercial labs have reams of paper already printed with NELAC*
 - *Maybe the new organization could buy the name for \$1*
 - *Is one name the best way to go?*
 - *Meet with EPA attorneys?*
- Ballots
 - *Using 2 names might make things easier in dealing with states and legislatures in showing that the recognition is controlled by the other states*
 - *International should be used in place of national or American; i.e., NELAC International*
 - *Use environmental measurement instead of laboratory in any name*
 - *Obtain written ruling from EPA Office of general counsel about the use of the NELAC/NELAP name*
 - ANELA (5)
 - ASELA (9)
 - NELAA (33)
 - Write in
 - NELAC/NELAP (49)
 - NELA2
 - International Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Congress (INELAC) (2)
 - National Accreditation Program for Environmental Measurement (NAPEM) (2)
 - National Environmental Laboratory Association (NELA)(2)
 - National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Consortium (NELAC)(2)
 - Accreditation Association for National Environmental Quality (AANEQ)
 - American Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Association (AELAA)
 - Association of Environmental Testing and Accreditation Organizations (AETAO)
 - American Society of Environmental Measurements (ASEM)
 - Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP)
 - International Association for Environmental Lab Accreditation (IAELA)
 - National Association for Environmental Laboratory Accreditation (NAELA)
 - NELA
 - National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Commission (NELAC)
 - NELAC International

- *National Environmental Measurements Accreditation Association (NEMAA)*
 - *New Organization for Environmental Laboratories (NOEL)*
 - *National Organization of Testing Environmental Program Association (NOTEPA)*
 - *United States Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Board (USE LAB)*
 - *Anything that does not end in ELA*
 - *Anything but NELAC/NELAP*
- **Communication plan**
 - *Web cast worked well – continue to use the internet as much as possible.*
 - *The fear is that despite all the discussions held and the apparent openness, that the decisions have already been made, and that the timeframe is so aggressive, that this is it and we are going forward. Somehow all parties have to be convinced that their input is needed and desired.*
 - *Electronic newsletter to be sent out to every e-mail address on file since the 2001 NELAC meeting.*
 - *Try to use the AAs to communicate to their accredited labs.*
 - *Use a single POC to issue and receive e-mails so that spam filters do not eliminate the messages and messages can be routed properly.*
 - *ACIL and other trade association newsletters could be used.*
 - *Use regional or state societies such as FSEA.*
 - *Believing it is true – looking from the outside – it feels like we are in 1994 again because you might not believe it is not open participation to ask for input*
 - *Don't do it like you did before – at some point you stop listening to the other states – at some point AZ started to vote no – voted no because he wanted people to ask why – pay attention to them – states are on board – made it happen for them – the rest all left*
 - *Want an open a process where implementing the standards – states want to be included and listened to*
 - *Is it possible that some of these committee meeting minutes could get posted on the web so everyone could get up to date*
 - *What about participation9 about conferences calls*
 - *A better web site*
 - *Support staff to make the posting happen*
 - *Allow for continued input*
 - *Use AAs as communication focal point for the accredited community*
 - *Use one source for information distribution and responses*
 - *Use trade association newsletters to distribute information*
 - *Use state lab associations*

Attachment 1: Outline for Breakout Sessions

Part 1: Introduction

15 minutes

The moderator of the breakout session should begin by going over the “rules” and purpose of the breakout sessions.

- This is a comment session to gather suggestions and obtain constructive feedback on the models presented
 - All ideas will be “good” ideas – i.e., all speakers will be provided the courtesy of making their point without criticism
 - This should not be a debate – all comments should be directed to the model and not to another individual’s comment or idea
- Questions will be part of the session but they should be for clarification on what was presented.
- For each model presented, focus the discussion on gaining suggestions:
 - Ask for alternatives for the model
 - Ask for pros and cons for each model
 - There will be a projector in the room so slides of the PPT presentation can be shown to facilitate the discussion.

Part 2: Organization

45 minutes

The organization chart should be used to help guide the discussion. The discussion will focus on the key programs, the duties to be performed in each key program, and who should participate in each key program.

- **Key Programs**
 - Have all the key programs been identified?
- **Duties**
 - Are there additional tasks or duties that should be added to the program areas?
- **Participation**

You may address all the boxes on the chart, but there will probably be limited questions on some of them.

 - Umbrella

The model presented has open participation for the Umbrella. The major duties of the umbrella are: to elect the board, confirm program areas and provide a mechanism for members to have discussions (i.e., a forum)

 - Are there alternatives to open participation in the Umbrella Organization?
 - If there are alternatives, what are the pros and cons to the alternatives?
 - Accreditation

Explain this is essentially a blank box. We do not have a model developed yet. We do know it will include standards adoption, recognition of AAs, and the PT Program. NELAC will be forming task groups (States and PT) to further develop the model for this area. As a result, the objective is to identify issues for those groups to address

- What are the issues that have to be addressed when developing the model for standards adoption?
- What are the issues that have to be addressed when developing the model for the recognition program?
- What are the issues that have to be addressed when developing the model for the PT program?
- Standards Development
 - Explain we are recommending the use of the INELA model*
 - Are there any other alternative that should be considered?
 - If yes, what are the pros and cons to the alternatives?

Part 3: Governance

45 minutes

- **Corporate structure**

The facilitators will explain the proposed makeup of the Board.

- Are there groups that need to be considered for ex officio status on the Board?
- Are there other models for Board membership that need to be considered?

- **Membership**

The facilitators will explain the proposal to combine the INELA and NELAC memberships.

- Are there any alternatives to this model?
- If yes, what are the pros and cons to the alternatives?

- **Personnel**

The PPT agreed that the new Executive Director would be selected by the board and that each key program could have a program director (staff, contract or volunteer). The board will determine how to manage the program directors.

- Are there any alternatives to having program directors?
- Are there any alternatives to having the Board select the program directors and having the program directors report to the Board?
- If there are alternatives, what are the pros and cons to the alternatives?

Part 4: Continuation of Essential Functions

45 minutes

- **Functions**

The PPT believes that all issues related to interim functioning of both organizations have been considered. Essential functions for both organizations include:

- *NELAC Functions*

- AA mutual recognition
 - AA accreditation of labs to the national standard
 - A2LA continuing as PTOB
 - All EPA cooperative agreement work continues
- INELA Functions
 - INELA standards development continues
 - INELA continues essential business operations
 - All EPA cooperative agreement work continues
- **Transition plan**

The transition plan calls for forming a transition board and then moving functions to the new organization in an orderly manner. We believe we have a plan to cover all alternatives. If there is an appeal of an accreditation decision, it will go to the state. If there is a complaint about an AA, the AARB will investigate within the constraints of policy

 - Are there any other transition issues the NELAC Board should consider?
 - Is there an alternative to forming a transition board and migrating the functions?
 - If yes, what are the pros and cons to those alternatives?
- **Name**

There are three options for the name of the new organization. Vote for one:

 - Association for National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation (ANELA)
 - American Society for Environmental Laboratory Accreditation (ASELA)
 - National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Association (NELAA)
- **Communication**

The presentation summarized our communication plan.

 - What other communication strategies do you suggest?